

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-33, 35-37, 43, 45, 47-49, 51 and 52 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 19-33, 35-37, 45, 47, 48, 51 and 52 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

By this amendment, claim 2 has been canceled, independent claim 1 has been amended, and independent claim 49 has been rewritten in dependent form. Thus, claim 1 is the only independent claim that is currently being examined.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 8-18 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaDue (US 2003/0133423) in view of Halloran et al. (US 5,966,667) and further in view of *newly cited* Soloff (US 5,013,718).

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the character recognition device (from previously presented claim 2), that each of the master microprocessor and the microprocessor of the buffering device is capable of controlling the character recognition device, and that the communication device is a handset. This amendment is supported in the original specification at least by the exemplary embodiment at page 11, lines 11-15, in which the intermediate smart card 80 (example of buffering device) can take over control of the handset display.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 would not have been obvious in view of any reasonable combination of LaDue, Halloran, and Soloff.

Soloff describes an innovative method and device for storing digital video signals enabling a substantial reduction of the size (capacity and also physical) of the RAM device. At

the time of Soloff's invention (i.e., 1990) RAM devices were quite low on capacity and large amount of storage capacity that can store video signals yielded in a very big storage device. Most of such devices at that time were not the size of a hand held telephone. Usually such devices were installed in a desktop computers. Moreover, hand held video cameras at that time were analog and therefore video storage was done in an analog way on a magnetic tape with no special need for digital video storage devices.

Further, in 1990, microprocessors and their peripheral elements such as memory, Input / Output drives etc. devices, took a space equal to a size of a cellular device of today. Popular microprocessors were at that time 8051, 8080 etc.

The microprocessor disclosed in Soloff is quite a simple one with respect to its operations, e.g. only providing a write enable signal on an accurate time, providing a rotation signal on an accurate time etc. These functions could have been implemented by using simple counters that at that time were cheaper. The point here is that Soloff describes quite a simple task needed from the microprocessor. Thus, it is quite clear that for such a task the requires peripheral devices that are surrounding the microprocessor are quite few and simple (e.g. write enable generators (22) or output enable generators (23)).

Nevertheless, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply the teachings of Soloff, that his solution required at the time it was suggested (1990) a microprocessor module *that is capable of controlling* the character recognition device.

Furthermore, the recited microprocessor of the buffering device, which is capable of performing some functions of master microprocessor, a very smart microprocessor module. Such a module has to perform a large set of sophisticated demands, e.g., a microprocessor that can

pretend to be the microprocessor of the buffering device, and vice versa. In such a way, the SMS messages that were created with the assistance of the microprocessor of the buffering device can be sent with the assistance of the master microprocessor.

Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply the teachings of Soloff in such a manner to implement the recited microprocessor module, as Soloff would have required a microprocessor module with a size of a desktop computer.

Having said that, our invention requires the microprocessor module to be significantly smaller than the size of a cellular handset. Otherwise, such a module CANNOT be a part of the recited *communication device that is a handset*. That is, the claimed device includes a buffering device that is a small add on to a handset in order to enable creation, which enables the creation and sending free hand SMS messages.

Thus, for the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of the dependent claims at least because of their dependency from claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 09/915,563

Attorney Docket No.: Q64293

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/John M. Bird/

John M. Bird
Registration No. 46,027

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 11, 2008